

REMARKS

Receipt of the office action mailed March 30, 2010 is acknowledged. Claims 1-32 are pending in the application. Claims 1-32 are objected to for various informalities, and are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (2). In keeping with the foregoing amendments and the following argument, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

In the telephonic interview conducted on March 26, 2010, the Examiner and the undersigned attorney discussed claims 1-32, and agreed that claims 1-32 appear patentable pending the correction of various informalities and resolution of Section 112 issues. The Examiner and the undersigned agreed that the needed corrections were numerous, that some involved the correction of complex mathematical formulas, and that the issues were not suitable for correction by Examiner's Amendment.

In response to the claim objections, with the exception noted below, Applicants have corrected each of the items listed in numbered paragraphs 2-30 of the detailed action. Claim 16, which included the imaging stage, has been canceled. Claim 17 has been made independent. Accordingly, the objections are overcome.

With respect to the "at least in part" language in claims 1 and 5, Applicant notes that it is possible to perform the method of claims 1 and 5 using X-rays to the exclusion of other imaging techniques, and by using X-rays in conjunction with other imaging techniques. Therefore, the pertinent language is technically correct, and the scope of the claim is clear. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 5 are in allowable form.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-32 under 35 USC Section 112, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 5 to include an imaging stage in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion in numbered paragraph 16.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 5 in accordance with the suggestion in numbered paragraphs 17 and 18.

With respect to claim 17, the language noted by the Examiner in numbered paragraph 19 has been amended. With the amended language underlined below for ease of reference, claim 17 now recites, in part, calculator means for responding to said simulation to calculate individual sound signals to be emitted by at least some of the transducers of said array of

transducers in order to obtain the at least one predetermined target soundwave field in the substantially homogeneous medium, locator means for using at least some of the transducers of the array of transducers to locate an initial position of said array of transducers relative to the bone barrier by echography, the initial position an approximation of the specific position, and position-refiner means for refining the initial position of the array of transducers relative to the bone barrier as a function of the position of the array of transducers as located relative to the bone barrier in such a manner that the position of the array of transducers relative to the bone barrier corresponds to the specific position. The amended language is now more fully consistent with the disclosure at, for example, pages 2 and 3, and with claim 1. Accordingly, claim 17 is now in proper form.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

July 27, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

David C. Read

Registration No.: 39,811
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive
6300 Willis Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicants